DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 166 198 TM 007 649

AUTHOR Kim, Joyce S.
TITLE Evaluation of Educational Quality Assessment (EQA) (Follow-up Survey for the 1976 Assessment).
INSTITUTION Pennsylvania State Dept. of Education, Harrisburg. Bureau of Planning and Evaluation.
PUB DATE Jan 78
NOTE 46p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Educational Assessment; Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; Information Dissemination; *Information Utilization; Questionnaires; School Districts; State Programs; *State Surveys; *Testing Programs; Test Results
IDENTIFIERS *Pennsylvania Educational Quality Assessment; Pensylvania

ABSTRACT

Superintendents from 155 school districts in Pennsylvania were surveyed regarding their participation in Pennsylvania's 1976 Educational Quality Assessment (EQA). Ten state goals for quality public school education were assessed in grades 5, 8, and 11, as part of the EQA. Questionnaire responses were returned by superintendents from 128 school districts, and focused on: (1) extent of dissemination of EQA results; (2) usefulness of EQA data; and (3) contributions of the EQA advisory service. Results indicated that the assessment results were widely disseminated, using a variety of means to publicize the data. Over 88% of the districts responding indicated that EQA information had been used for program planning. Thirteen percent of the districts had not yet used EQA data; this was largely attributed to lack of staff time. The most useful results involved the following goals: verbal and mathematics basic skills; self esteem; interest in school; and vocational aptitude. Opinions regarding the accuracy of the data and the assistance in interpreting it were also surveyed. The twenty-item questionnaire and extensive quotations from the comments received are appended. (Author/GDC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED166198

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL QUALITY ASSESSMENT (EQA)

(FOLLOW-UP SURVEY FOR THE 1976 ASSESSMENT)

Prepared by: Joyce S. Kim

Edited by: Kenneth R. Miller

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Robert Calderon

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Division of Educational Quality Assessment
Bureau of Planning and Evaluation
Pennsylvania Department of Education
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

January 1978

TM007 649

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	2
PROCEDURE	2
FINDINGS	3
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	14
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX I	16
Follow-up Opinionnaire to Superintendents for the March 1976 Assessment	
APPENDIX II	21
Verbatim Report of School Districts' Comments	

INTRODUCTION

The resolution passed by the State Board of Education in November, 1973 mandated a systematic assessment of all Pennsylvania school districts with an established timetable. Its unanimously adopted regulation stated:

> "During the school years 1973-74, 1974-75 and 1975-76, the Department of Education shall use the Educational Quality Assessment procedure to evaluate the effectiveness of the educational program for all Commonwealth school districts based upon the Ten Goals of Quality Education adopted by the State Board of Education. Public schools housing approximately one-third of the students enrolled in each of the three grades 5, 8 and 11 will be included in the assessment each year."

Under this mandate, about 500,000 fifth, eighth and eleventh grade students in Pennsylvania's 505 school districts participated in the EQA program by the end of the 1975-1976 school year - the third and last year of the Commonwealth's mandatory three-year assessment cycle. Approximately one-third of the districts (155 in number) participated in the 1975-76 assessment which was the third year of the mandatory three-year testing cycle. The number of schools and students assessed during the 1975-76 school year, including one-third of Philadelphia's schools was:

Grade	Number of Schools	Number of Students
5	674	44,008
8	232	47,288
11	179	40,643
TOTAL	1,085	131,939

All of the participating districts received their school reports from representatives of the Division of Educational Quality Assessment in the fall of 1976.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

EQA is designed to offer reliable statistical information about strengths and weaknesses of schools from which school officials can base sound educational planning decisions. Schools are encouraged to use the results as they wish. EQA's function is to provide schools with a point of reference for initiating a self-analysis of their programs.

EQA follow-up surveys are important in order to ascertain what effect the data and information provided by the Division of EQA have had on the local school programs. Some of the questions answered were: To what extent have the assessment results been disseminated? What value do school districts see in EQA? How relevant are the EQA results to educational and planning decisions?

PROCEDURE

This follow-up survey was conducted in the districts that had participated in the March, 1976 assessment. The criteria for selection of a representative sample were: student enrollment of the district, socioeconomic level determined by the financial aid ratio and geographic balance.

On September 15, 1977, the Division of EQA mailed a 20-item Follow-up Opinionnaire to superintendents of the 155 school districts which participated in 1976. Replies were received from 128 districts by

the end of December, 1977. As shown in Appendix I, the Opinionnaire included questions to ascertain reactions to the assessment. Questions in the Opinionnaire focused on: (1) extent of dissemination of EQA results, (2) usefulness of EQA data, and (3) contribution of the EQA advisory service. Survey results were valuable for EQA because the Division is in the process of revising procedures, measurement instruments and condition variables for post-1977 assessments.

FINDINGS

Through the 1976 follow-up survey, it was found that a wide dissemination of the results had been made. The assessment results have been disseminated to various categories of publics and organizations. The approximate number of persons involved in each category was:

Persons Involved	Number
School board members	849
Principals	637
Central office staff	364
Elementary teachers	6,350
Middle/junior high school teachers	3,575
High school teachers	4,904
Local service clubs (Lions, Jaycees, etc.)	272
PTA, PTO, any parent group	3,391
Students	34,739
General public	571,272
Other:	18,106

Citizens Advisory Council
Community Advisory Council
Counselors (guidance, health services, other support personnel)
District News Digest
ESEA Advisory Council
Local Ministerial Association
Long-range Planning Groups
News Media (newspaper, newsletter, TV, radio)
Parent Advisory Committees
Superintendent's Advisory Board

N = 128 districts N: Number of school districts that responded to this question.

Dissemination strategies included many different approaches such as special written reports, school district newsletters, in-service training, PTA presentations, etc. Approximately 85 per cent of the districts had presented the EQA reports to both their school boards and faculty members. In addition, nearly 80 per cent of the school districts had prepared press releases for their local newspapers. It was found that EQA information is being shared widely with many kinds of publics through different dissemination methods as shown below.

QUESTION: WHAT METHODS HAVE BEEN USED TO INFORM OTHERS ABOUT THE EQA REPORT?

Methods Used	Per Cent
Special written report	54.7
School district newsletter	55.5
Press release	78.9
Faculty memorandum	37.5
Curriculum bulletin	7.8
In-service presentation	66.4
School board meeting	90.6
Faculty meeting	84.4
PTA presentation	39.1
Special presentation	21.9
Regular meeting	14.1
Other	2.3
None	3.1

N = 128 districts N: Number of respondents.

Over 88 per cent of the districts indicated that EQA information has been reviewed with building administrators for their use in program planning. About 57 per cent of the districts indicated that the EQA information was used to reflect the favorability of their present programs. Only about 13 per cent of the school districts said that they

had not, as yet, used the EQA data. Approximately 12 per cent of the responding districts explained the non-use of data was due to lack of time on the part of district personnel.

QUESTION: WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING DESCRIBE THE USE MADE OF THE EQA INFORMATION?

Use Made	Per Cent
The information has not, as yet, been used	13.3
The information was used to reflect the favorability of our present programs	57.0
A new program is being planned for one or more of our schools as a result of the information	30.5
Revisions of some existing programs are underway as a result of the information	40.6
The information has been reviewed with building administrators for their use in program planning	88.3
The information served as a basis for teacher in-service activity	32.8
A new program has been "tried out" in one of our schools as a result of the information	11.7
A new program has been incorporated into one school's program as a result of the information	13.3
A new program has been incorporated into several of our schools as a result of the information .	10.2

N = 128 districts

Most school districts (95 per cent) were satisfied with the thoroughness of the EQA interpreting team's report and 80 per cent of the districts indicated that they did not need a follow-up interpretation session.

As far as goal priorities are concerned, the particular goals often chosen as the five (out of ten) most useful in planning were: Basic Skills-Math, Basic Skills-Verbal, Self-Esteem, Interest in School and Learning, and Vocational Attitude. The Basic Skills received the highest vote (68 per cent and 67 per cent for Math and Verbal respectively).

Although the strong emphasis on Basic Skills is noted, at least 32 per cent of the school districts did not include "basics" in the top five and obviously believe that they (school districts) have effect and responsibility in other areas of the curriculum as well.

QUESTION: MARK THE FIVE GOAL AREAS FOR WHICH THE INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE ASSESSMENT WAS MOST USEFUL IN PLANNING.

Goal Areas	Per Cent
Self-Esteem	49.2
Understanding Others	26.6
Basic Skills-Verbal	67.2
Basic Skills-Math	68.0
Interest in School and Learning	39.8
Societal Responsibility	24.2
Health and Safety Practices	19.5
Creative Activities/Recognition	25.8
Vocational Attitude	32.8
Vocational Knowledge	30.5
Appreciating Human Accomplishments	16.4
Coping with Change	19.5

N = 128 districts

More than one-half of the districts administered standardized achievement tests during the 1975-76 school year at all grade levels two through eight. Survey results indicate that achievement testing falls markedly when students enter the senior high school level. In addition, not one school district reported the total elimination of administration of standardized achievement tests.

QUESTION: AT WHICH GRADE LEVEL(S) DID YOU GIVE A STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST IN THE PREVIOUS SCHOOL YEAR?

Grade Level	Per Cent	Grade Level	Per Cent
1	49.2	7	53.1
2	62.5	8	61.7
3	75.0	9	28.9
4	76.6	10	31.3
5	71.1	11	29.7
6	74.2	12	6.3
		NONE	0

N = 128 districts

More than four out of five districts felt that the EQA data have relevance not only for change in course content but also for change in teaching strategies.

QUESTION: HOW RELEVANT IS THE INFORMATION PROVIDED IN THE REPORT TO DECISIONS WHICH MUST BE MADE IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS?

Changes Made in:	Very Relevant	Quite Relevant	Relevant	Not Relevant	No Answer
Course offerings	9.4%	18.0%	42.2%	21.1%	9.4%
Course content	10.2%	21.1%	50.8%	10.2%	7.8%
Teaching strategies	15.6%	17.2%	46.9%	14.8%	5.5%
Teaching assignments	3.9%	4.7%	25.0%	53.9%	12.5%
Financial allocations	5.5%	10.2%	33.6%	41.4%	9.4%
School facilities	3.9%	4.7%	20.3%	59.4%	11.7%

N = 128 districts

Many districts entertained suspicions of existing problems, but they did not have data to support those suspicions. Almost 90 per cent of the districts reported that EQA had either provided them with data

that confirmed such suspicions or that EQA data had called attention to problem areas which were not previously detected by district staff. This is particularly gratifying to the EQA staff, since the aforementioned is an important component of the program.

THE EQA INFORMATION:

17.2%	(a) Called attention to a problem area not previously noted by district staff.
46.9%	(b) Confirmed suspicions about district problems.
24.2%	(c) Did not identify any serious problems.
0.8%	No answer.
7.0%	Marked both a and b.
3.9%	Marked a, b and/or c.

N = 128 districts

It is significant to note that over 78 per cent of the responding school districts considered the EQA program as a means of helping them make decisions. In addition, more than 70 per cent of the districts believed that the EQA information represents a true picture of their district. The latter figure represents the highest percentage recorded for the three-year period.

QUESTION: HOW DO YOU CONSIDER THE EQA PROGRAM AS A MEANS OF HELPING YOU MAKE DECISIONS?

13.3%	(a) very useful
64.8%	(b) useful
18.0%	(c) not very useful
1.6%	(d) useless
2.3%	No response

N = 128 districts

QUESTION: DO YOU BELIEVE THE EQA INFORMATION REPRESENTS A TRUE PICTURE OF YOUR DISTRICT IN THE AREAS ASSESSED?

71.1% -- Yes
23.4% -- No
5.5% -- No response

N = 128 districts

Nearly 60 per cent of the districts said they used criterion-reference subscale scores in their explanation of the results, and almost 76 per cent felt that item response frequency data would be valuable if given with the initial report. This is particularly important when considering a revision of the present reporting format in the "School Report: A Status Profile."

QUESTION: DID YOU USE CRITERION-REFERENCE SUBSCALE SCORES IN YOUR EXPLANATION OF THE RESULTS?

58.6% -- Yes
26.7% -- No
4.7% -- No response

N = 128 districts

QUESTION: WOULD ITEM RESPONSE FREQUENCY DATA BE VALUABLE IF GIVEN WITH THE INITIAL REPORT?

75.8% -- Yes
21.1% -- No
3.1% -- No response

N = 128 districts

Condition variables which were collected to identify the differences in resources among schools came primarily from students and teachers as part of their assessment questionnaires. Over 80 per cent of the districts claimed that condition variable data are not harmful. Only eight districts answered "Yes," when offering comment on the harm done (as opposed to being helpful) by collecting information on conditions which have effect on the school district's results. Most districts indicated an interest in the information (condition variables) which are used to compare "similar schools." About 65 per cent of the districts indicated that the follow-up booklets on intervention strategies for improving goal scores have been of value to them.

QUESTION: IS CONDITION VARIABLE DATA MORE HARMFUL THAN HELPFUL?

7.1% -- Yes
82.0% -- No
10.8% -- No response

N = 128 districts

QUESTION: WERE THE FOLLOW-UP BOOKLETS ON SUGGESTED STRATEGIES OF ANY VALUE?

64.8% -- Yes
5.5% -- No
26.6% -- Not received
3.1% -- No response

N = 128 districts

Of the 20 items included in the Opinionnaire, four questions asked about suggestions, comments and evaluations regarding EQA's program. These questions were:

- What do you feel is the value of EQA?
- Can you suggest any programs, approaches or techniques used in your district that may account for any high scores you have? (above the 75th percentile or above the prediction band)
- What type of assistance would you like from the PDE as a result of the assessment?
- Please add any comments you wish regarding the assessment programs.

Direct quotations from school districts' answers to the above questions are shown in Appendix II, Verbatim Report of School Districts' Comments. Comments are categorized by the nature of their key points. I.D. numbers listed with each comment are not identical to the EQA's school code number.

QUESTION: WHAT DO YOU FEEL IS THE VALUE OF EQA?

Nearly 73 per cent of the districts responding to this question claimed that EQA has provided them with not only a valuable measurement tool for planning and evaluation, but also with results of educational outcomes in both the cognitive and affective domains. Most of these districts felt that the EQA program is educationally sound, useful and relevant to their programs for educational change and development. Only two districts expressed the opinion that the EQA instruments need revision, though the theory itself is commendable. Only three districts felt that the EQA program had no value. These districts indicated that adverse publicity hindered EQA's value and, in addition, they felt that

the program would be more effective if it were to include more cognitive and fewer attitudinal measures.

QUESTION: CAN YOU SUGGEST ANY PROGRAMS, APPROACHES OR TECHNIQUES USED IN YOUR DISTRICT THAT MAY ACCOUNT FOR ANY HIGH SCORES YOU HAVE? (ABOVE THE 75TH PERCENTILE OR ABOVE THE PREDICTION BAND)

Nearly 40 districts presented programs, approaches or techniques in their own districts which might account for any high scores they had. These districts' assessment scores were above the 75th percentile or above the prediction band. Fifteen districts felt that their high scores resulted from their emphasis given to basics and other learning skills. Sixteen districts indicated that hard work, dedicated teachers, in-service work, administrative structure of program and relevant instruction were contributing factors. A combination of community, parental involvement and school characteristics was explained as reasons for attaining high scores by three districts. Five other districts reported other suggestions which could not be grouped in the previously selected categories.

QUESTION: WHAT TYPE OF ASSISTANCE WOULD YOU LIKE FROM THE PDE AS AS A RESULT OF THE ASSESSMENT?

Fifty-four districts responded to the questions about their intention of getting assistance from the PDE as a result of assessment. About one-third of the districts asked for assistance in the follow-up or implementation strategies, in the long-range plan, and in developing or

obtaining materials which would be helpful or enhance goal areas. Over 35 per cent answered that assistance is adequate and said to EQA, "You have been absolutely great with us - no complaints, only praise." Seven districts wanted better presentation of materials for public relations purposes, in-service workshops or continued advisory assistance.

QUESTION: PLEASE ADD ANY COMMENTS YOU WISH REGARDING THE ASSESSMENT PROGRAMS.

Sixty-six out of 128 districts affirmed additional comments regarding the assessment program. About one-fifth of them commended the successful work of EQA saying, "I feel this was a highly successful and monumental effort," "...a worthwhile undertaking," "we feel the assessment program should be continued," "... excellent approach to give insight to school district...," and so forth. Basically, most of them believed that the results of their assessments were valid. About one out of four districts which responded to this question recommended an improvement of instruments, utilization of EQA in long-range plans, and revised format. More emphasis on the cognitive aspect of education was suggested by about 17 per cent of the districts, which is nearly double the percentage that previously responded this way to this question. Only six per cent of the districts claimed any problem associated with the invasion of one's personal privacy.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM CYCLE THREE

About 83 per cent of the school districts that participated in the assessment program responded to the follow-up survey which was designed to secure reactions to the program and to obtain suggestions for program planning in post-1977 assessments.

On the basis of the 1976 EQA follow-up survey results, the following conclusions and recommendations are made:

A majority of the districts again indicated that the EQA program was very helpful in the fulfillment of needs assessment of their schools, and also provided them with pertinent information and comparison data which were not otherwise obtainable.

The EQA information continues to be widely disseminated to many persons, agencies, mass media and other organizations via many different methods and techniques throughout the Commonwealth.

Many districts expressed the opinion that EQA data have the most relevance for them in conjunction with change in teaching strategies, course offerings and course content. Also, most school districts were satisfied with the overall assessment procedure and with EQA consultant services.

Some school districts which enjoyed favorable assessment results presented several factors accounting for their having attained high scores. Those factors included emphasis on basics and other learning skills, dedicated teachers, in-service training, well-structured administrative management, relevant instruction, and a combination of community involvement, parental participation and school characteristics.

Most districts continue to feel that the EQA program is educationally sound and provided reliable data concerning both the cognitive and affective domains. Cycle Three school districts seemed to indicate a need to have the EQA program include more cognitive measurements which was attributable to many reasons, i.e., the "Back-to-Basics" movement.

Further improvement of assessment instruments, EQA assistance in implementation of intervention strategies, and utilization of EQA data in long-range planning were some of the suggestions offered by a few districts.

In general, as shown by the survey data, it is concluded that the March, 1976 EQA assessment was very successful in meeting its stated purposes and in providing valuable assessment services to the participating schools in Pennsylvania.

APPENDIX I

Follow-up Opinionnaire to Superintendents

for the March 1976 Assessment

DISTRICT _____
POSITION _____

Educational Quality Assessment (EQA)
Follow-Up Opinionnaire to Superintendent
for the
March 1976 Assessment

1. To whom have your assessment results been disseminated? (Indicate the approximate number of people involved for each category.)

____a) school board members
____b) principals
____c) central office staff
____d) most elementary teachers
____e) most middle/junior H.S. teachers
____f) most high school teachers
____g) local service clubs (Lions, Jaycees, etc.)
____h) PTA, PTO, any parent group
____i) students
____j) general public
____k) other _____
____l) none

2. What methods have been used to inform others about the EQA report? (Mark as many as are appropriate.)

____a) special written report
____b) school district newsletter
____c) press release
____d) faculty memorandum
____e) curriculum bulletin
____f) inservice presentations
____g) school board meeting
____h) faculty meeting
____i) PTA presentation
____j) special presentation
____k) regular meeting with _____
____l) other
____m) none

3. Which of the following describe the use made of the EQA information? (Check as many as appropriate.)

____a) The information has not, as yet, been used.
____b) The information was used to reflect the favorability of our present programs.
____c) A new program is being planned for one or more of our schools as a result of the information. (List goal areas.)

____d) Revisions of some existing programs are underway as a result of the information. (List goal areas.)

____e) The information has been reviewed with building administrators for their use in program planning.

_____f) The information served as a basis for teacher inservice activity. (List goal areas.)

_____g) A new program has been "tried out" in one of our schools as a result of the information.
_____h) A new program has been incorporated into one school's program as a result of the information.
_____i) A new program has been incorporated into several of our schools as a result of the information.
(If g, h or i has been checked, please list goal areas.)

4. If in item 3 you check (a), please check the statement below which best describes the situation in your district.

_____a) The information was not sufficiently credible to merit use.
_____b) District personnel have not had enough time to put the information to use.
_____c) The results did not contain any useful information.
_____d) Other (Please describe)

5. Was the interpreting team thorough enough in its explanation of the report? _____Yes _____No _____I was not present

6. Should there have been a follow-up interpretation session?
_____Yes _____No

7. Mark the five goal areas for which the information provided by the assessment was most <u>useful</u> in planning.

_____Self-Esteem
_____Understanding Others
_____Basic Skills-Verbal
_____Basic Skills-Mathematics
_____Interest in School and Learning
_____Societal Responsibility
_____Health
_____Creative Activities/Recognition
_____Vocational Attitude
_____Vocational Knowledge
_____Appreciating Human Accomplishments
_____Coping with Change

8. At which grade level(s) did you give a standardized achievement test in the previous school year? (Mark as many as are appropriate.)

Grade Level: 1)_____ 2)_____ 3)_____ 4)_____ 5)_____ 6)_____ 7)_____
8)_____ 9)_____ 10)_____ 11)_____ 12)_____
None)_____

9. How relevant is the information provided in the report to decisions which must be made in the following areas?

	Very Relevant	Quite Relevant	Relevant	Not Relevant
a) changes in course offerings	____	____	____	____
b) changes in course content	____	____	____	____
c) changes in teaching strategies	____	____	____	____
d) changes in teaching assignments	____	____	____	____
e) changes in financial allocations	____	____	____	____
f) changes in school facilities	____	____	____	____

10. The EQA information

____a) called attention to a problem area not previously noted by district staff.
____b) confirmed suspicions about district problems.
____c) did not identify any serious problems.

11. How do you consider the EQA program as a means of helping you make decisions?

____a) very useful
____b) useful
____c) not very useful
____d) useless

12. Do you believe the EQA information represents a true picture of your district in the areas assessed? ____Yes ____No
If no, which areas.

13. Would item response frequency data be valuable if given with the initial report? ____Yes ____No

14. Did you use criterion reference subscale scores in your explanation of the results? ____Yes ____No

15. Is condition variable data more harmful than it is helpful?
____Yes ____No If yes, which variables?

16. Were the follow-up booklets on suggested strategies of any value?
____Yes ____No ____Not received. If no, which goal booklet(s) and why?

17. What do you feel is the value of EQA?

18. Can you suggest any programs, approaches or techniques used in your district that may account for any high scores you have? (Above the 75th percentile or above the prediction band)

19. What type of assistance would you like from the PDE as a result of the assessment?

20. Please add any comments you wish regarding the assessment programs.

APPENDIX II

VERBATIM REPORT OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS' COMMENTS

SCHOOL DISTRICTS' COMMENTS
MARCH 1976 ASSESSMENT

WHAT DO YOU FEEL IS THE VALUE OF EQA?
(OPINIONNAIRE TO SUPERINTENDENT - #17)

Valuable Measurement Tool for Planning and Evaluation

ID No.	COMMENTS
133.	If EQA results are good or bad, we in this school district analyze each and every objective and gear our programming to our evaluation.
141.	Results gave evidence (whether accepted or not) of suspected weaknesses and strengths. If nothing else, the program has helped to initiate sound thinking among staff.
154.	It establishes a set of base line data previously unavailable.
163.	It points out some areas where additional study and a needs assessment may be necessary.
175.	As a means of confirming viewpoints held by the district, it is a very helpful device. In some cases, data on particular buildings stimulated principals to re-examine priorities. The English amd math goals are of particular interest to us. The affective areas, generally, were less helpful.
178.	It is another tool in the evaluation process. I cannot vouch for its validity, nor can I say it is not a valid instrument. My concern for the test does not center on the test but rather the goals and the equal weight of each goal. Any school, even the best, cannot say that they actually aim at all those goals on an equal scale. There first is not enough time to do everything. Many of those goals are actually how a student "feels" and that is developed from birth with a great many influencing factors.
186.	Extremely helpful if looked at objectively. Too many people are afraid of it. Also some community members may try to use it politically.
205.	The EQA gives the district the opportunity to validate its own perception and establishes a base from which program, curricular and long-range planning changes can occur.
216.	It could provide some guide for districts striving to improve their program.

ID No.	COMMENTS
227.	a. It places emphasis on the broader aspects of education. b. It gives us an organized way of evaluating our efforts as to effectiveness in the ten goals. c. It opens up our school to a sharing with our clients... the parents and the community. *d. It is a well planned and extensively researched evaluating instrument which has no equal on the contemporary scene.
247.	Helps us evaluate the district. In our case, gives value to our program.
274.	EQA gives a district an overall view of how it compares with other districts.
300.	Helped our schools evaluate, substantively, student and staff attitude and achievement.
306.	Another evaluative instrument to use by our district in conjunction with many other evaluations we use.
317.	We are currently utilizing much of our knowledge gained from EQA in the work on our Long Range Plan. We feel the information will help guide us in many of our recommendations when completed.
334.	As a yardstick for evaluating total school program.
347.	It forces every school to examine itself in terms of stated goals. Even when the tests and results are underwhelming, the exercise in self-evaluation is healthful.
366.	Present assessment is starting point for future plans.
370.	It lead to very interesting discussions with staff, board and public. Just getting these people to look at the system and discuss their ideas was valuable.
379.	It provides school districts with an opportunity to compare their students' characteristics with characteristics of students in similar districts throughout the Commonwealth.
394.	Many diversified forms of evaluation applied to given situations tend to confirm or reject suspected hypotheses.
396.	Comparison with other schools in the Commonwealth indicates areas of weakness and strength. Seems to be acceptable by both the professional staff and the public. Provides a common denominator for schools in the Commonwealth.

ID No.	COMMENTS
440.	It is another way for educators to examine what our students are doing in comparison to what is expected. After accepting the information, we begin to change programs, teachers and students.
442.	It provides one additional evaluative tool to help us understand how our students are able to perform in comparison to other students from different school districts, but with similar backgrounds.
458.	EQA provided us with the opportunity to view an outside agency's scrutinization of our program. Much like a Middle States Evaluation, it caused us to do some "soul" searching. Areas of need were zeroed in on. Because of EQA we feel more comfortable in prioritizing our long range goals. Some of our suspicions were validated by the report.
484.	Helps school districts evaluate themselves in relation to other schools.
500.	Self-evaluation.
512.	Will indicate shortcomings of a school district's program which otherwise may not be identified. Provides an impartial evaluation of programs and how they are accepted by the student.
545.	a. It provides a different set of evaluation promoters within which students' perceptions can be measured. Resulting "indicators" are useful to us. b. The statewide norms also provide a "bench mark" for comparison to determine strengths and weaknesses.
200.	The same value as any other assessment tool. The EQA has the added value of incorporating predicted status as well as comparison figures based on schools with similar characteristics.
567.	It is an essential vehicle which makes us look at our self and what we do.
361.	Good evaluation of student attitudes toward academic and career areas. Identifies strong and weak areas within the schools being tested. Impartial evaluation instrument.

ID No.	COMMENTS
611.	a. Provides our school district with an appraisal of attitudes, values, beliefs, and habits. These are areas for which we previously did not have an assessment on a districtwide basis. b. It enables teachers and administrators to compare the assessment results with statewide results. c. By utilizing the predicted score range, the assessment provides a very fair way to compare the results of any given school against a predicted score area based upon the many possible variables that are present in that school. d. The amount of data which can be retrieved from the reports is very extensive.
195.	It helps a district to assess community climate--especially in those areas which ultimately affect student performance. It gives direction for innovation.
202.	Very helpful for us in developing Long Range Plan. Exceptionally helpful to individual principals in strengthening programs.
283.	EQA helps with general program assessment; it also helps as we work to develop our Long Range Plan.
410.	a. Comparisons that can be made to other districts and comparisons that can be made with the school districts of the Commonwealth as a whole. b. Knowing what our district's predicted range is has proved to be valuable. c. An outside evaluation is often more objective. d. It encourages the staff to improve and serves as the impetus for new programs and improvement of existing programs. e. It presents to the public, an outside evaluation of where we stand as a district compared to other similar districts.
473.	It provides the district with information about its students, teachers, community and administrators. This information would not be readily available without EQA. It can also confirm or dispute assumptions that have been made about the district. It provides information that could be used to establish goals and to give reason for change.
484.	The information can be valuable in citing areas of concern where steps might be taken to improve educational programs.

ID No.	COMMENTS
487.	Can be used in conjunction with other evaluation measures. Reinforcement of positive views concerning some district programs. Provided an opportunity to assess results in some areas that hadn't been measured to date.
509.	Generates discussion and thought concerning the school's objectives. Provides data to support curriculum revision. Indicates a general overview of our district with regard to goals measured.
521.	It gives the local school district a chance to compare our results with other schools.
527.	The value of EQA, in my opinion, is in the areas of self-evaluation and communication/public relations. This program is one more tool for this school district to use to describe to its population the fine job the schools are doing.
599.	Primary value seems to be in area of <u>needs</u> assessment.

Educational Outcomes - Cognitive and Affective Domains

ID No.	COMMENTS
127.	It seems to be heading in the right direction for providing data, particularly in the affective learning area. Suggest that data be used to further refine instruments.
217.	It can expose problem areas. Provides an opportunity for comparison.
242.	As another measure of the effectiveness of our school district.
245.	It has focused school and community attention towards the academic programs presented by the school district.
279.	Information made available that otherwise might not be.
303.	The attempt by the state to assess educational achievement.
309.	Comparative measurement of "like" schools. Focus upon weak or problem areas.
348.	Subtests give comparison with similar schools.
376.	Provides a comparison of student achievement in contrast to economic factors with expectations and similar districts throughout the state.

ID No.	COMMENTS
378.	EQA is a good tool to survey various attitudes and academic areas. It serves as a thought-provoking tool. If dealt with objectively, it is valuable.
438.	An additional objective test instrument to assess learning in the district.
454.	It is an important part of a districtwide needs assessment. Also, it provides a means of comparing your school with other schools in Pennsylvania.
530.	Although attitude surveys have questionable reliability, this is the only such survey we give in conjunction with our achievement. Test results give us a larger, if not clearer, picture of our student body. With teacher negotiations in vogue, the staff perceptions are likely to be most slanted.
577.	a. Another indicator of accountability and indices of behavior status and change in students. b. Increased awareness of affective areas which are often neglected.
607.	The EQA gives the district some information about how effective it is in the affective area.
124.	It does give indications of possible weaknesses that should be reviewed. As an instrument, it does assess to certain degrees the strengths and weaknesses of the present academic program.
422.	It is simply another method to try and assess the present status of the district in several areas. Taken alone, the assessment has little value; but combined with other instruments, it can be a valuable tool to show district trends.
165.	It does give the local school district the opportunity to see itself in relation to other schools of similar characteristics. To me this is important. You can draw some comparisons and work from a starting point.
190.	It calls attention to non-academic goals which are vital to the development of attitudes and values.
329.	Gives a better understanding of how your school fares in comparison with similar school districts, both in the cognitive and affective areas.
474.	It allows an insight into strong areas and weak ones. It quickly references our success to fundamental teaching but still takes into account other factors in life and learning.

ID No.	COMMENT
480.	Provides an appraisal of the school in most matters related to the development of children as they proceed through district programs.
511.	It calls attention to those areas in which this school district is compared with the rest of the Commonwealth. It indicates where assumed weaknesses lie.

Need Improvement

ID No.	COMMENTS
313.	Not much value. Too much value oriented. Should be structured more toward competencies.
468.	EQA is an attempt to address the accountability problem facing the school districts in the Commonwealth. Hopefully, the model will be changed to overcome community resistance to accepting it. Eventually it should become an excellent guide for implementing curriculum change.
503.	I would be more interested in dealing with those skills--namely the basic ones--that I have some reasonable control over.

Somewhat Limited

ID No.	COMMENTS
113.	I believe that EQA has limited value to local school districts because of its general nature. I believe a local needs assessment based on specific objectives and criteria would be more beneficial to our school district.
192.	In verbal and math, it gives statewide comparison. Other areas need not be included.
330.	Quite frankly, I am not sure. Since our initial fling with EQA in 1972-73, we have wrestled with its value. I feel that an item analysis statewide might have positive results. Our own EQA results show us to be a bastion of traditional values. However, we were aware of our mores. We are proud of our accomplishments which are confirmed by EQA.

ID No.	COMMENTS
403.	EQA merely serves as an additional check on the school and its multifaceted programs. It does give the school an idea of how its program compares with the other schools in the state.
460.	The testing instrument used to gather information which probably would not be available otherwise.
514.	Compares our schools with districts of similar size and circumstances.
561.	As one source of data to assist in evaluating the educational program.
572.	Provides additional data for assessing student and district needs.
578.	a. It has supportive values in assisting a person to make judgments about the quality of the learning program. It is only one source, however; and one does not use it as the sole basis. b. It, too, might have been of greater value if we had not already been involved in doing many other things such as completing a building program, community career learning, in-service courses, and IGE processing.
464.	The projected value of using a standard instrument such as EQA is statistically sound. We do not see any outstanding value of this particular instrument over any other instrument used in the measurement of achievement. In fact, it has less to offer in the areas of cognitive skills.
168.	It is of comparative value.
273.	Little value.
302.	It is of value but the overall picture is a difficult task, in the subject areas of math and verbal, the evaluation was of most value because we can have a real "hands on" ability to attempt some remediation.
449.	Findings too broad and we find it difficult to pinpoint. One or two student answers result in too great a score variation.
568.	Not very valuable. It seems to me that values are very difficult to test with a paper and pencil objective test.

No Value

ID No.	COMMENTS
118.	Prostitution of EQA's original objectives makes its value negligible or even negative.
170.	I don't feel it is of great value. Your goal should be to help us with our problems, not impose an assessment procedure on us. We know our problems. Why not use the money to help us solve them? State mandated programs of this type are worthless; even worse, they are a slap in the face of a professional educator.
570.	The controversy surrounding the test made it of no value.

Miscellaneous Opinions

405.	It provides us with an objective evaluation of our efforts. The comparison with the other districts and the districts which are of similar socioeconomic and demographic characteristics were not helpful.
448.	EQA confirmed our deficiences.
466.	The most difficult situation is to have someone who thoroughly understands all materials and has the available time to coordinate all activities.
559.	Not sure. We have no money to use.
428.	It puts down in writing what you already suspect. It puts things in proper perspective.
316.	Statistical self evaluations: predictors other than basic knowledge.

CAN YOU SUGGEST ANY PROGRAMS, APPROACHES USED IN YOUR DISTRICT THAT MAY ACCOUNT FOR ANY HIGH SCORES YOU HAVE? (ABOVE THE 75TH PERCENTILE OR ABOVE THE PREDICTION BAND) (OPINIONNAIRE TO SUPERINTENDENT - #18)

Dedicated Teachers, In-Service Work and Administrative Structure of Program

ID No.	COMMENTS
127.	Small school and close relationship between students and teacher.
175.	We feel that our high scores in some of the cognitive areas are a function of the excellent leadership provided by our department coordinators.
178.	We had many areas over the 75th percentile. It is a manifestation of many years of consistent hard work. This is a small school with a sense of pride and tradition which I feel goes a long way in the kind of test the EQA test represents.
192.	Quality program, quality teachers, interested capable students.
205.	Not in any predetermined fashion; good staffing would account for most high scores in long-range planning (in a serious manner) is only now beginning.
217.	Dedicated staff. Continuous progress philosophy.
245.	No specific programs, rather the attitudes of staff members and the instructional strategies.
334.	a. Strong emphasis on basic skills. b. Good guidance service on the senior high level regarding post high school opportunities. c. Teacher emphasis on creativity.
396.	No, I believe the most successful programs are based on having highly dedicated teachers and staff using a variety of approaches or techniques.
442.	Close supervision and control of each individual student's progress in the basic skills program, especially through the elementary years, seems to have provided high scores in the skills areas.

ID No.	COMMENTS
454.	Extensive in-service programs in the affective as well as the cognitive domains.
460.	Occupational and vocational carrells.
428.	A career program.
611.	In the cognitive areas, our results were high because of the fact that this school district has programs for all special education groups. Included is a gifted program which has been functional for 10 years. We also have a complete progression of electives which begins in the seventh grade and allows students to advance their work in most disciplines. This school district has an extensive testing program. Much time has been spent on the analysis and interpretation of these results with the classroom teachers.
439.	Our Vocational Grant Career Program resulted in a high score in Goal VIII. Increased efforts in the health curriculum increased scores in Goal VI.
480.	We have tried to develop an awareness of each student as an individual.

Emphasis on Basics and Learning Other Skills

ID No.	COMMENTS
113.	Most of our scores fell in or above predicted ranges. I believe a strong comprehensive program will help most school districts score well on the EQA.
216.	a. Levels approach in reading and good remediation program. b. Good art program at high school.
300.	High priority and emphasis on basic skills program.
303.	Our stress on the basics and on daily discipline.
315.	Mathematics--continued use of traditional arithmetic program in the elementary schools.
348.	Concentration on basic skills throughout the district.
376.	Emphasis on basic skills.

ID No.	COMMENTS
379.	Heavy emphasis in basic skill instruction in math and verbal areas.
405.	We scored in the high range in the math and verbal. This is due, in my opinion, to a strong program in the "basic" area.
440.	Our increased emphasis on career guidance in the secondary schools, especially the senior high school, seemed to have had a dramatic affect on the career awareness goal--from 18% in 1972 to 98% in 1976.
545.	This school district has been involved in an extensive objective-based (PPBS) curriculum program for several years in the basic skills areas of math and reading. Our students did well in Goal III.
572.	a. Grades 8 and 11--creativity is high due to the art, industrial arts and music programs. b. Grades 1 thru 6--individualized educational programs meeting specific student needs.
527.	This school district has emphasized basic skills for a long time. We continue to do so. All programs are heavily supervised and are adjudicated according to one all-encompassing criteria: student achievement.
568.	The strong emphasis on congitive skills was demonstrated.

Combination of Community, Parent Involvement and School Characteristics

ID No.	COMMENTS
347.	The many high scores attest to the community's concern for excellence and achievement. The school district's concern for humane values may have contributed to exceptionally high scores on Goal I.
403.	Extra curricular activities in the areas of the arts such as the performance and production of musicals, theater and art exhibits.
464.	Scores above the 75th percentile seem to be confined to attendance areas and relate more to parental attitudes than programs in schools.

ID No.	COMMENTS
410.	The high scores in the area of societal responsibility is probably due to the conservative background from which our students come. A feeling of deep concern for family and friends is prevalent in our area.

Miscellaneous

ID No.	COMMENTS
577.	Specific areas have been established as priorities.
474.	Health and safety are constantly adhered to by all. Our theory is that if it is unsafe, it is wrong. In Coping With Change, we approach our many necessary changes in a low key manner.

No Specific Suggestion

ID No.	COMMENTS
330.	Although we were above the 75% in 8 categories, we were in the predicted range for all but 2 categories.
378.	Our district scored well on the academic areas. (Math and Verbal)

WHAT TYPE OF ASSISTANCE WOULD YOU LIKE FROM THE PDE AS A RESULT OF THE ASSESSMENT? (OPINIONNAIRE TO SUPERINTENDENTS - #19)

Follow-up Strategies and Long-Range Plan

ID No.	COMMENTS
127.	More specific direction as to how and what curriculum revisions should be made to bring about improvement of specific goals.
154.	A list of intervention plans and techniques to improve low scores on the various goal levels would be helpful.

ID No.	COMMENTS
178.	The department can help us best by being ready to aid us with expert help in areas that defy definition such as self-esteem and understanding others. The Executive Academy programs have been a great help.
227.	An expanded commitment toward helping districts make curricular changes to improve their effectiveness relative to the ten goals. When a score is low and the district elects to make a change, help is needed in deciding: (1) what should be changed; (2) how to go about making the change; (3) and justifying the changes to the community.
247.	The PDE agreed to a follow-up session with the board.
315.	We may be calling for assistance at a later date as we proceed with our Long Range Plan.
348.	Program development assistance in areas of perceived and validated need.
376.	We have been receiving PDE assistance in curriculum development.
405.	More detailed research on why the schools that do well in this test do so well.
448.	Provide consultative help as needed.
572.	To have available field representatives in curriculum areas (English, math, social studies, science) to provide direction and suggested programming.
611.	What is provided is effective. If we had a particular problem which emerged from the results, we would appreciate assistance in coping with the problem.
165.	Perhaps more assistance in the matter of how to improve upon some of the low scores. (Such as suggestions, speakers, programs for parents, etc.)
195.	More direction regarding model programs in existence.
410.	Availability of resource persons and materials when developing programs to correct deficiencies.
509.	Consultant service for improving areas in which we scored low.

None At This Time, No Complaints, But Praise

ID No.	COMMENTS
133.	Adequate assistance has been provided by the local intermediate unit.
300.	Same as before with more refinement in item analysis.
347.	None on basis of our results.
440.	Your assistance was adequate.
454.	We received all the assistance needed.
316.	The department has been most helpful when necessary.
474.	Your help thus far has been sufficient.
511.	At this time, there appears to be no need for assistance. Thank you.

Improved Presentation for Public Relations and In-Service Worksho

ID No.	COMMENTS
163.	Consultants' Service as needed and requested.
216.	Some assessment of the attitude of parents toward our schools that results directly from the courts playing "Super School Board!!"
334.	Workshop for teachers on how to improve curriculum on the basis of our EQA results.
458.	Follow-up visits by PDE personnel to work with our teachers on a building level. We need assistance in convincing teachers that the state is, in fact, interested in this endeavor.
611.	We need an extensive statewide public relations program designed to explain why our schools must begin to reorient their planning in terms of goals. Also, how the program sequences in our schools can best be changed to achieve these goals.
329.	In-service training for teachers.
568.	Helping teachers to understand the affective domain.

Further Interpretation of EQA Results

ID No.	COMMENTS
514.	A better assessment of math and verbal scores.
545.	We would like an evaluation specialist to be available to our staff for analysis of the item information. The amount of actual data is overwhelming to staff. Someone who can sift through the reports and extract the pertinent information and interpret it into more meaningful information to those involved. This is the missing ingredient.
464.	The state should not put as much emphasis on comparison with other schools. Also, the emphasis placed on scores above the 75th percentile and below the 25th percentile was never intended to dictate the direction of long range plans and be discussed in terms of weaknesses and strengths. There is too much emphasis on the results as being valid when eight of the areas are in the affective domain.
449.	Further interpretation--complete and detailed.

Others

ID No.	COMMENTS
205.	Further refinement of test questions (specifically basic skills) so that the administration can make specific recommendations for change (I understand this is already in progress).
378.	Like most districts, financing the whole educational process is getting to be out of the question. It is tough to add anything to the curriculum today.
460.	Dollars, not now available, to implement programs.
361.	Increased financial support for the Basic Skills area (our identified weak area).
428.	Financial assistance.

PLEASE ADD ANY COMMENTS YOU WISH REGARDING THE ASSESSMENT PROGRAMS. (OPINIONNAIRE #20)

Highly Successful and Monumental Efforts, Worthwhile Program

ID No.	COMMENTS
178.	The EQA program is of value to a school district. The real value comes with the followup. It is not the kind of a test that should be the single criteria for change, but rather one of a series of tools. This district has developed over the past few years a very frank, direct system of informing the public of both our strengths and our weaknesses as we see them. There is no question in my mind that this helped us develop a good relationship with our community thus paving the way for a very well-informed and supportive public.
205.	Regardless of negative reactions statewide to EQA, I feel it is one of the more positive endeavors of the PDE. The value for me lies not in a comparison to other districts, but that it provides one of the few objective evaluations our school encounters. This allows our administration and board to make improvements with a substantiation of our needs in the school program. The community lacks the insight to understand areas such as affective learning and your data has helped us convince them of its role in educating students.
279.	The testing was easily done. Reporting team (interpreting team) did a fine job.
300.	We would like to stay on cycle. It helps for more meaningful tracking and evaluation of all students.
330.	I commend the promulgators of EQA, the people handling it at your level, and the intent of the program. Keep sharpening the items, eliminate the pseudo - creative portion and don't get swallowed up by Project 81.
347.	An evaluation process is needed and helpful in long range (very long range) planning. I hope you can resist any pressures toward simplistic interpretations of EQA assessments.
405.	EQA was and is an excellent idea for fostering the improvement of our public schools. It provides an excellent analysis of our efforts. Please continue the process.

ID No.	COMMENTS
440.	It is a program that gives us information that is not otherwise available. School districts could never construct or implement such an assessment program. This program should be closely related to Project 81.
442.	I feel the assessment instrument was of good quality. It has been of value to the district in my opinion. With additional emphasis on the skills areas, it should be an improved assessment.
572.	We were well pleased with the data that were supplied for our district. This report confirmed our suspicions of weaknesses in our programs.
611.	In spite of any groups who might have a negative response to the EQA, it is the best assessment instrument available.
165.	I personally feel the tests have a great deal of merit. They should be continued with revisions every year.

Need Improvement

ID No.	COMMENTS
113.	I believe the department should take a hard look at the timetable for the administration of the EQA. It makes little sense to administer the EQA in the year following a work stoppage in the school district. Attitudes of staff, students, and community have a bearing on EQA results. I think we should also take a hard look at the staff assessment section of the EQA in order to deal with this problem.
118.	a. Eliminate the teacher questionnaire b. Eliminate statewide percentiles.
186.	Keep working on it. Don't give in to those factions that seem to be "upset" for some reason.
216.	a. Districts of our size and location resent the total move toward the centralization of education and the educational philosophy in the State of Pennsylvania. b. Regional differences must be given more realistic consideration.

ID No.	COMMENTS
279.	We really aren't geared for it, or to read the statistical abstract either. I continue to express concerns over measurements that cannot reflect attitudes, etc. I would prefer measurements for those items that are measurable and other approaches (or more) for most goals.
334.	Teachers and administrators have some questions about the validity of the assessment itself--not the goal concepts.
347.	Since revisions are in progress, I'll avoid making unnecessary recommendations. My only concluding comment is that the goals measure outcomes of total programs and total experiences. To expect to change test results by tinkering with programs is naive. If a change can be effected easily, then the test probably measured superficialities.
394.	More emphasis must be placed upon the value of evaluation and the resulting positive results that exist for the most part.
545.	I strongly feel that the societal responsibility questions need major revision.
559.	I think it needs continuous work.
567.	Improvement is needed.
422.	If the assessment questions were the same year after year, there might be some value in noting trends. When the assessment is consistently altered, comparisons are difficult.
611.	Until something better comes along, you should refine it if necessary, and continue to use it extensively.
464.	The test should eliminate most of the affective areas. The creativity area is unrealistic in the field of measurement with projected value. There is no definition acceptable and, therefore, the measurement is worthless.
316.	The department's present position regarding reevaluation of EQA and the goal areas will be most welcome.
410.	The EQA should not be administered more than once every three years. Questions need to be more definitive so that answers might be more meaningful.
509.	The attitude measurements were excessive in number compared to the achievement type questions. Wording of statements appeared to be leading, in a negative sense, at times. Relevance and identification with some questions was difficult, if not impossible for some students.

More Assistance

175. I realize that it would mean detailed programming being plugged in, but it would be helpful to have scores on the goals for the district as a whole as well as for the individual buildings.

186. See the two items enclosed. Is it possible to prepare a similar print-out that could be copied for reference when discussing with teachers, board members, etc.?

227. There should be a plan so the results of the "tests" can be related directly and specifically to the youngster who provided the information.

379. The present percentile method of comparison makes it extremely difficult for school districts to interpret the actual meaning of the results.

394. Independent (Predictor) Variables from administrative department records and teachers are loaded, providing data not easily understandable. Unless a direct relationship can be demonstrated with student output, it is useless.

403. The program should be so structured so as to alleviate the amount of paperwork required of administrative personnel.

448. The stress on attitudes is not the entire responsibility of the public schools, although the EQA implied as much.

509. Continued refinement of the instrument is recommended, particularly with regard to the expected outcome of Project 81.

Need More Emphasis on Cognitive Aspects of Education

ID No.	COMMENTS
118.	a. Input variables should be explained clearly. b. Maximize cognitive assessment; minimize affective assessment.
175.	Increased emphasis on the cognitive domain would be beneficial to us.
242.	There should be more cognitive areas.
378.	We would like to see more academic areas included. This would help sell the EQA to the public since they are more interested in the moves back to the basics.

ID No.	COMMENTS
396.	More cognitive emphasis. We are involved in Project 81 and would like to see the test reflect a higher emphasis on measurable skills rather than attitudes.
454.	Include more cognitive areas.
545.	I would extend the language arts area to include language usage, composition, etc.
168.	I would like to see the program become more objective rather than subjective.
474.	I'm glad that EQA does take into account basic skills. Too often in recent years, schools have been too responsible for too many other areas, thereby diluting their responsibility here or turning from it entirely.
480.	I am glad to see that efforts are underway to improve evaluation of a student's skills in math and verbal.

P.R. Problems

ID No.	COMMENTS
216.	I am not advocating turning your back on Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, but please don't stick us with all of the irrelevant programs and information that may be meaningful to them. We have differences in this state that are caused by geography, weather, and population.
227.	It would help to be able to state to the "test takers" that this would also give them information about themselves.
313.	Our low marks regarding administration have something to do with the time of the year it was administered. February is a "down" time for personnel.
348.	There was some resistance on the part of community and staff to the affective education section of the EQA.
464.	The emphasis on news releases and with the attempt to make comparisons does more harm than good. The district with certain needs and environment cannot be put into a similar sample with so many different attributes and then be compared in totality with the established group. Especially since most of the areas are affective to begin with. Our chief concern is that EQA will be another form of "the Regents" which has been under discussion for many years. The efforts may be more

ID No.	COMMENTS
	beneficial in promoting competencies rather than the general affective areas. Also, the "average" is so misleading when you have a skewed population.
195.	A better job has to be done to minimize paranoia and fright on the part of districts and the school.
449.	Although PDE has fairly attempted to discourage comparative use of scores between local schools, the results are too difficult for the public and some educators to comprehend; this results in unfair comparisons of schools to scores.

Other Opinions

ID No.	COMMENTS
170.	Forget this whole farce and concentrate on helping districts solve their problems through more money and more in-service opportunities.
192.	We have an official letter filed with the Commissioner of Education.
303.	As I told the committee, I do not believe you can evaluate feelings and opinions in a paper-pencil test. (Interest in School for example).
313.	Some students made a joke of the test. Our limited administrative staff does not permit time to adequately follow through. We will be using the results with our Long Range Planning update which is just beginning. We should have a more positive report next year.
348.	There was some resistance on the part of community and staff to the affective education section of the EQA.
403.	Some means should be used to persuade the students to answer the questions truthfully and not just to get it done.
124.	It is too impersonal to achieve accurate results. Students do not take certain sections of the test seriously.
273.	I had previously corresponded with Dr. Coldiron relative to my thoughts on EQA.
316.	Some areas seem to be of an extremely personal nature at the present time. These areas need reworked.